

Frank Wernette

From: William Loudermilk [WLOUDERM@hq.dfg.ca.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, May 19, 1999 8:07 PM
To: fwernett@delta.dfg.ca.gov; JWHITE@hq.dfg.ca.gov; NMURRAY@hq.dfg.ca.gov
Subject: [dfgwppt] FW: SUMMARY OF DAT CONFERENCE CALL, 19 MAY 1999-Forwarded

[dfgwppt] FW:

SUMMARY OF DAT C... attached is a prime example of why I feel Alternative 5 (with a VAMP twist) should be DFG's choice recommendations to the SWRCB.

At the end of the 31 day pulse period, if smelt are in the s.Delta and exports go up as planned (or even stay static the way it looks) the lack of inflow from the south really exacerbates the bottleneck. I can't envision much help at all from barrier operations either.

In the earliest hearing phases we had a hard time selling (gave up) the concept that Vernalis flows were needed to help meet X2-because it's so far downstream and its "push" is lost in tidal action. However, in a year like this you could be pumping lots of Sac River water out to meet X2 targets but still hit the yellow/red lights in the BO due to the southern proximity (fish and exports). I'm not saying we're gonna see enough water from the SJ basin immediately-but putting the target out there (a la Alt. 5) and holding these water right holders to "good science" (you know, live or die by it) will lead us incrementally back to a connected watershed. I think the Service could get behind this, CALFED may too over time, and the State Contractors (maybe even Westlands and Nelsons folk) may ultimately be at least neutral.

Food for thought.